App F. IX-4

Previous References

1930.
(Mezra)

File No. 206-30

Serial Nos. 1 — 9

~~*Letter References.*~~
7.5 to 1-9
1-4
[illegible]
[illegible] 3-4-9

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 9.

Part B for December 1935

SUBJECT.

re offering worship to Sri Mallikarjuna Swami at Yagati pura in the Kadur Taluk on the annual Rathotsava day

Sri C. Lakshmana Gowda BA BL Advocate for Memo V. P. Mallappa & 25 others of Yagati No 846 of 18-12-35

WD 0418—GPB—22,500—29 8 36

Dismisses the petn agreeing with the order of the Mezra Court

General and Revenue Secretariat M/43 File No. 206 of 1930.

Serial No.

Petition of 1.12.30 from Messrs Y. P. N. Mallappa, N.M. Sivalingappa Petitioners appealing against the order of the Muzrai Commissioner in appeal no 19 of 1929-30. in the matter of Offering worship to Sri Mallikarjuna Swami at Yagatipoma in Madras Taluk on the annual Rathotsava day -

(1) The appeal is in time & the petition is duly and sufficiently stamped

(2) Major appeal be admitted & the records connected with the case called for from the M.C.

4337 5/12

4/12 H. Secy)

5:12:30

(8th member) 24/12/30.

Record may be called for (The case will then be dealt with after records are received & same placed before members

3462

Issue 13.1.31

NOTE - Contn Sheet

W D 02553—50,000—GPB—8 7

Mag atopr 16 of 31

802

File No. of 193 Q

No 1549 of 14-1-31 to the Magrate 2
Commissioner forwarding the file
in Revn 1 for submission of the
Rec of Criminal side Case.

Letter no 1150/30-31 of 14.3. 3
from the Magrate Commissioner
submitting records connected with
The Affray of worship to Sri
Malleswara Swami at Yagati
in Kadur Taluk.

Sass 16/3/31

2 Records relating to O.S. No 59
of 1865 of Kadur The civil Court refd
to in para VIII of the P.R.D are not
found among the records received
from the M.C. It is for orders if ch
is necessary to obtain the records
in this case from the High Court
to give a decision in the present appeal

3 The facts of the case have
been reported & orders at Govt are passed
thereon. Vide G.O. No 3184/Mag 5-58-18-4
of 26/8/20 and No 2428/Mag 755-19-7
of 7-3-23

(1) The appellants
May be asked to
send for reversal
of the movement
of the High Court's
R/ in this Case
(mm
2/4/31

G.S. 31/3/31 H. Secy (1) 31-3-31

1st Member 1.4.31

(P.S. This is eminently a case for compromise among the
When I was DC at Kadur
bar sects. I tried my very best to persuade the Brahmins
in the way the M.C (Mr. D'Souza) has expressed in the order
under appeal. But I failed. The mamool as enjoined
by the Govt of 1923 was followed on the occasion.

79)

App. F. 111—24

General and Revenue Secretariat — Mis3 File No. 206 of 1931

Serial No.

Mr Dss
Mr
G.S Cb
6/4

15) Issue
VS
6.4.31

No 21997 4 1931 to Messrs
G. P N Mallappa Setter Caveat
for a Copy of the Judgment
in O.S No 59 of 1865 — Kadur
Taluk Civil Court received
in this petition.

No 22007 4.3 to The
Advocate for Petitioners.
Letter dt 7.5.1931 from A.M.C.
Asking to forward an attested
Copy of the Judgment in O.S. No 59
of 1865 of Kadur Taluk Civil
Court.

7-5-31) (1) Please See on the P. & D.
Please mark the relevant portions and
Note upon the Case."

Kind ref^e is invited to G.O No
3184/Mis3 558-18-4 dt 26/8/20. As seen
from the report recorded in this G.O, the Brahmin
are reported to have for the Exclusive right of
Worship from time time the Vaishnava
Ranganatha Tile the Car is drawn
a few Steps. The D.C Kadur has also given
Their a Carefull record of the Manual Customs
the matter.

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 02558—GPB—50,000—8 7 30

Dated on 2.9.20 one Mr Ariyappa
Vellan Lingayen Pujaris preferred an
appeal before Govt & the same was
rejected. (Vide order no 2428/Mtz 753-19-7 H.
of 7.3.23) - The same records refer to
a prosecution order given under the
Seal of the First Member of Council
against Ariyappa for having presented
an affidavit, the contents of which
were found to be false.

(2) The temple in question is a minor
Mtz. Institution receiving a Cash
grant of Rs 7/4 p.a. Same of the Lingayat
devotees in 1923-24 went to the length of
asking for the cancellation of the Cash
grant & the removal of the Institution
from the list of Mtz. Institutions.
This was not accepted. Vide Mtz file
229-24-1 - The records reveal that
The Rajaguru of the Swamis is conducted
as per principles of Saiva Agama (- Vide
Vernacular Record Marked C)

The entire position of the case
was reported by the D.C to H-C on 14.6.26
after the disposal of the appeal pending before
him in Feb 1926. On a recommendation
of the H-C, orders were issued in this office
letter no 753/Mtz 235-27-9 of 26.10.26 P
for the removal of certain Dharmadarsis
& for dismissing certain Archakas of the temple
on account of their acts referred to therein

Mug Appl (No 16-06-30 App. F. III—2]

General and Revenue Secretariat

Mug File No. 206 of 1930.

Serial No.

21) It is respectfully submitted that at every stage The local Officers have reported that the Contention of the Linga-et Pujaris & the Devotees of the Temple is untenable. M.C. in appl. No. 19/29-30 has held that The institution is practically a Lingayet Temple with certain other observations referred to therein. So long as it is a Mug. Dai Institution, the Conduct of affairs relating to the Institution rests with The local Mug. Officers etc.

22) The appellants rely upon the records of O.S. No. 5-9 of 1865 of Kadur Taluk Civil Court (a copy has been produced by them). Here is no reference in this record to The appellant's right to the performance of certain ceremonials at the very outset of the celebration of the annual Rathotsava functions.

5 A1

G.S. worth for orders if the case may be looked from a correct 10/5/31

H. Lacey)

1st Member)

11.5.31

30/5/31

A Mys

3/6/31

5.6.31

3-1-1931

2024

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 02553-GPB—50 000-8-30

File No. of 193 General and R Secretariat

Applicants are served
with notice—
Thereafter applicants are staked
which are reposed to take
notice as seen from the
ends of one Patel Karegaon

GS
WPS

File No. of 193 Genie Se

Mys A.T.J. No. 168 of 1931 Re Premises in Gaggenahalli Agrahara Nuladeveranahalli of 1931 Rathotsavadag—

General and Revenue Secretariat | Mjz. | File No. 206

Serial No.

Case called on 27th July 1931.

2) Mr. Lakshmana Gowda for the Appellants asked for an adjournment: one of the Respondents Nadig Mylariah has also pleaded inability to be present today.

The case is, therefore adjourned.

722/28/7

Hon'ble J.G.-C. 28/7/31

2) The case was called on 30th Nov. 1931 Of the appellants Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40,

Case taken up on 14.3.32. The report from the Amildar is that the respondents have refused to accept service of notices. The Amildar should have made a full report as to why they have refused and of the refusal is a fact that they should have been required to record the fact themselves. Please advise DC and say that if necessary & issue instructions to prevent such indifference to action to be taken in respect of service of notices.

DS Appellant's lawyer one Lakshmana Gowda was present and he has been informed that the case will be heard on early date after issue of fresh notices. 14.3.32

14/3/32

W/P and is posted in June 29.
Fresh notices have to issue of this case also is taken up for hearing on 26th inst. A

Draft for perusal before issue.
A is for orders.
17/3/32

A Time is too short.
Next date to which case may be posted may be given.
17-3

Letter No. 1298 of 14.3.32 to the D.C., Kadur, issued.

1. Draft approved
2. A letter 20 days 18/3

22.3.32

6563

Serial No.

36 This case was heard on 25th April 1932.

37 Of the ~~three~~ appellants, three namely 1, Y.P.N.Mallappa, 5. Channa Veeraiah and 10. B.M.C.Aradhya were present and were represented by their lawyer Mr. Lakshmana Gowda. Neither the respondents nor any lawyer on their behalf were present.

---

38 Notices were issued to both the Respondents Nadigara Ramanna and Nadigara Mylariah. Mylariah has received the notice and Ramanna, ~~however~~, has represented that he could not be present on account of illness. Mylariah should ~~xx~~ have been present and he has not made any report as to why he could not appear. The presence of both the respondents is necessary on the next occasion when the case will be heard with a view to see if a solution by compromise is possible.

This is a case in which it is best that there is an amicable understanding between the two parties. I suggested the general lines of such an understanding. Mr. Lakshmana Gowda, the lawyer for the appellants, stated that he would make a serious attempt at inducing his clients to agree to an arrangement which might be considered reasonable from the point of view of both parties. He asked for time for about a month for this purpose and this has been allowed.

25/4/32

26/4/32

Petition of 27/4/32 — filed.
Vadiq Mylaiah of Yagati Kadur Taluk
stating that he could not be present on
25/4/32, The date of hearing the appeal,
for reasons stated therein and submitting
Copies of depositions of some of the
appellants before the Amildar —
Kadur Taluk —

The originals of the depositions
are in the Varamahal records —
The Mylaiah is one of the respondents
in the case & has requested for
these depositions —

A month's time has been
allowed to the Advocate for some
of the appellants (Vide Minute
in para 39 supra) — In the
meantime the may if agreed be called
by the First Member of Council for
perusal of papers returned by the Collr

Kept
27/4
(for Secy)

For perusal
27/4/32

1st Member

29.4.32

29/4/32

Mem
30/4/32

This may wait
until we hear from
the lawyer for Appellants
Object we need not press the parties —

Compromise Secy
30/4

Mem
5/6

2/6/32

0762

2 c.c. Kadur, Cranes

1. 2. After adjournment

Jeegatiburia Appeal case
1166

[App. F. III—2

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No. 106 of 1930..

Serial No.

Subtd-Grades as one months' time allowed in this Case is over.
(Ccco
2/6/32
Asst Registrar)

W. 3/6/32

Vide previous page for Members order.

Lowe
5/6.

W. In view of the Members' orders in para 46 supra, no reference to the Appellants' Lawyer appears necessary.
Secy
2/7/32

Lawyer as per Members Attempt Compromise from the Appellants' Lawyer.
2/7/32

We may ask the appellants' lawyer if any attempt at Settling this matter by Compromise was made and if so with what result - If he reports that no agreement is possible the Case has to be decided on its merits

6.7.0

Secy
6-7-32

Secy 4/3 Dy Secy Asstd
Secy 21/3

1 MAR.

REVISED

No 1373 and 1374 dy 23.3.1933.
Messrs C. Partha Sarathy & C.S. Venkata Swamy

NOTE—Contn Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—60,000—13-8 31

File No.

L C. Lakshmana Gowd Advocate Bangalore city calling for information Re: the compromise suggested

Information called for from the Advocate for the appellants is not received till date & reminder sent

12/8/33

No 2038 dt 14.8.33 to Mr C. Lakshmana Gowd Advocate calling for his remarks in the matter referred to therein

No 2044 dt 14.8.33 to messrs C. Parthasarathi L C. S. Venkata Advocates enquiring if any reply has been received—

5) The appellants' lawyer has not replied - If agreeable the file may be submitted to the present Dewan for orders

18/8/33

6) 22/8/33

Jt Secy)

7) 20/8/33

2nd Member)

Dewan)

8) 22/8/33

(9) It is not necessary that I should deal with this case - It may be disposed of by the Second Member—

25/8/33

Office of the Second Member of Council
23 AUG. 1933
No ...

4 (B-112)—71.11.31—20 000 Bks

DIAN POSTS AND TELEGRAPHS DEPARTMENT

This NOTICE. accompany any enquiry made respecting this Telegram.

Charges to pay.	
Rs.	As.

Office Stamp

Handed in at (Office of Origin.)	Date.	Hour.	Minute	Service Instructions	Words.
		8			

TO

Recd. here at 8 H 4 M

Court [illegible] and [illegible]
[illegible] Co [illegible] [illegible]
Train [illegible]
[illegible] [illegible]

Firestone Tyres-Tubes-Batteries MOST MILES PER RUPEE

suppl 16 of 30-31 re: Arrangements of Mirasdars Sri Malleshwaraswami Temple at Yaglati Prior to anniversary annual Rathotsava day.

[App. F. III—2

(e) Misc. File No. of 193

Serial No.	
	to submitted in the reference of the matters in para 5 of above
	Recd 26/8/33
	26/8/33
	II member)
	62) may be posted to some date in Nov
1st Nov. 1933 — 2 P.M.	
	JOI 20/9
	22/9
	Advocate of appellant was present The ~~appellants and~~ respondents were absent & Both Lane pleaded for the adjournment. Case adjd
Posted to 19th Feby 34.	JOI 11/11
	11/11
Posted to Monday the 9th April 1934 —	The case was called on 9th April 1934 Mr. C. Lakshmana Gowd Advocate for the appellants was present and heard & the respondents though served with notices were not present. Order reserved
7.4.34.	9/4/34

NOTE—Contn. Sheet.

WD 70—GBPM—50,000—13-8-3.

File No.

of 193



appl no 16 of 30-31 — Re Yerappa — Hunsa
Sy Talukmanjunath Swamy Taluka.

App. F. III—

General and Revenue Secretariat

File No.

Serial No.

The appeal is from the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner rejecting the appeal from the order of the Deputy Commissioner. After the appeal was filed, efforts were made by the parties to arrive at a reasonable compromise in the matter. For that purpose, a number of adjournments were granted from time to time. The records show that after hearing the appellant's counsel on the 25th April 1932, it was stated that an amicable understanding on certain lines was suggested to the parties. The counsel of the appellants seems to have stated that they were making serious attempts to induce the parties to come to a reasonable arrangement, and that if more time was given, there was every chance of the parties coming to an agreement. Further time was accordingly given. But when the hearing was again taken up on the 9th of April 1934, the Advocate stated that all attempts at compromise had been fruitless and that the case might be disposed of on its merits.

The Muzrai Commissioner agreeing with the Deputy Commissioner, found that the mamool was in favour of the respondents. No convincing arguments were advanced before Government to controvert this view. After a careful examination of the records, Government agree with the order passed by the then Muzrai Commissioner, Mr. P.G. D'Souza and dismiss petition.

14/12

14/12

14/12

NOTE—Contn Sheet

WD 01553-G P L—50 000- 8 7 30

File No. 206 of 1930 | Gen Secre

Submitted a ofor—

GJ 69 Dcd 17/12

No 846 of 19.12.35 to Mr C. Lakshmanan Proctor Advocate for the applicants—

No 847 of 19.12.35 to Mr Wadigamangawa Ramanna Etc— for information—

No 848 of 19.12.35 to Mr. Muthurajawela Commissioner forwarding Order of the above cases and returning the records received from him on the subject.

17. DEC 193
GENL & REV. SECTT.

B 2.1.36



BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANGALORE.

MUZ: APPEAL NO: 16 OF 30-31-

Orig 206-30-1

APPELLANTS:-

1. Y. P. N.Mallappa, son of Patel Nanjey Gowda, age 45 years, Jirayati, Dura, Yagati Hobli Kadur Taluk.
2. M.N.Sivalingappiah,
3. B. C. Marulaih, B.A.,B.L.,
4. M.N.Basappa
5. Channaveera
6. Basappa
7. Nanjappa
8. Sivalingappa
9. Ujjanappa, Patel
10. B.M.C. Aradhya
11. Nagappa, Patel
12. Sivasankarappa
13. P.S.Marule Siddappa
14. P.S. Sanna Nanteppa
15. Mallappa, Patel
16. B.M.Marulaiah
17. Ganeshana allieh
18. K. Marulappa
19. B.R.Channabasappa
20. Basappa, Patel
21. Siddalingappa
22. B.S.M. Rudraiah
23. Chikkabasaiah
24. Doddamane Kulappa
25. Shantappa Setty
26. Patel Penasappa

-----:VS:-----

RDENTS:-

1. Padigara Ramanna
2. Padigara Mylariah

and others.

=======

The humble petitioners most respectfully beg to prefer this appeal against the order of the Learned Muzrai Commissioner in Muzarai Appeal No: 19 of 1929-1930 for the following amongst other grounds Viz:-

(1). That the learned Muzarai Commissioner erred in holding that he could not look into the question of the Veerasaivas touching the idol and taking to the Mantap before procession since the Government Order is silent on the matter.

(2). That the learned Commissioner erred in holding that a mamool existed that only Brahmins should perform puja or touch or remove the idol to the Mathan as there is no evidence or legal presumption.

(3). That the learned Commissioner erred in that he ought to have held that all communities could serve God but not the Brahmins alone excluding Veerasaivas.

(4). That the learned Commissioner erred in not to have held that all are entitled to worship since such alleged mamool or usage has no force of law and cannot be exercised in Muzrai institutions as for example certain class of Brahmins who were excluded in Nanjangud Temple are now allowed to enter and worship.

(5). That the learned Commissioner's observations are sound but the conclusion of refusing to set aside the mamool is erroneous.

(6). That in the event of withholding the

- liberty

liberty of Veerasaivas in performing the Pooja etc.,there will be blood - -shed and trouble.

VII. That the appeal grounds of the lower Court may be taken as part and parcel of this application.

VIII. That the learned Commissioner erred in not looking into the records of O.S. No: 59 of 1865 of Kadur Taluk Civil Court since this clearly establishes that Brahmins have no right or control and that only the Veerasaivas and the hakas have the right and that the ple belongs exclusively to the - rásaivas since the respondents and ir ancestors are the witnesses in suit who have admitted to the rasaivas claim.

IX. That it is otherwise opposed law, facts and probabilities of the e.

W h e r e f o r e, the itioners pray that the Government be ased to review the said order and grant the lowing reliefs:-

(1). That the Brahmins have right to worship the Moola Devaru on Rathothasava day exclusively and that Veerasaivas alone could do.

(2). That the right of precedence

precedence of Brahmins in performing the Mangalarathi to the Moola Devaru on the Gangodbhava day is illegal and that the Veerasaivas only could do so.

(3). That the Brahmins be denied generally the alleged right of worship - independently of the Archakas.

(4). That the Institution is purely a Veerasaiva one and as the Bhakthas being 99.9 per cent Veerasaivas, the right to worship, management and control be vested in them only.

(5). And such other reliefs as the Government deems fit to grant in the - circumstances of the case.

Bangalore,
28-11-30.-
1-12-30

C. PARTHASARATHY. B, A, B. L.
ADVOCATE
BANGALORE CITY.



19

In the Court of

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore
at Bangalore.

Mysore
O.S.S.C. Appeal No. Of 1930-1931

Appellant~~s~~ ~~Plaintiff~~ Respondent~~s~~ ~~Defendant~~

Y. P. Nallappa & others Vs Nadigara Ramanna & others

~~I~~We Appellants above named do, by these presents, retain

C. PARTHASARATHY, Esqr B. A. B. L.
ADVOCATE.

to appear and conduct the above case on our behalf to judgment.

2. ~~I~~We further empower him to do all necessary acts in the above case, to execute any decree or order that may be passed in our behalf and to receive from the Court all documents, refunds, and all sums, of money that I/we may be entitled to get and grant receipts therefore and to refer to arbitration or compromise.

3. ~~I~~We also undertake to confirm and all the acts done by the said Advocate or by any other Advocate on his behalf in so doing

BANGALORE,
29.11 1930.
Personally known to me and signed in my presence,

Y. P. Nallappa
and others
B. L. Narasaya B. A. B. L.

Accepted 29/11/30
Advocate.

R. M. C.

Sree Chowdeswary Press B-City

accepted
B Ramasaradhy.
C.S Venkataswamy
Advocates
29/11/30





In the Court of the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

Dated, Bangalore, 12th September 1930

Muzrai Appeal no. 19 of 1929-30

Subject :- Offering worship to Sri Mallikarjunaswamy at Yagatipura in the Nadur Taluk on the annual Rathotsava day.

Appellants.

V/s G.P.N. Mallappa
Sivalingappiah
Ganesha Mulliah
and others.

Respondents.

Nadiga Ramanna
Nadiga Nagaraiah
and others

Facts of the case

The previous facts of the case have been stated in sufficient detail in G.O. No. 2428/Muz 755-19-7 dated 7th March 1923, and this office order 9, Dis No. 80 of 1925-26 dated 16th November 1925 and 9 Dis No. 194 of 26-27 dated 15th

1925 the petition of
theirs appealing against the order
of the Deputy Commissioner in the
matter of the dispute between the
Lingayats and Brahmins regarding
the precedence in the performance
of puja during Rathotsava was re
manded to the Deputy Commissioner
for giving a hearing to the parties
and holding a further enquiry into
the matter giving the parties an
opportunity to adduce any documentary
evidence on the questions at issue. and
it
[illegible] was therein directed that the
enquiry may be conducted either
by the Deputy Commissioner or the
Sub Divisional Officer and that the
result should be reported with a
finding for final orders.

2. As in the meanwhile the
Lingayat devotees submitted a
petition

February 1927 to Government and also presented petitions to the Dewan at Saribere in March 1927 Complaining that the Brahmins should not be permitted to perform Rathotsava without Legayet and requesting that the dispute Concerning the Rathotsava celebration may prefer ably be allowed to be settled in a ~~Civil~~ Civil Court

The parties were heard and this Office order of the 15th March 1927 was passed

3. With reference to the petitions submitted to Government by Chickanna Gowda basappa and others in March 1927 alleging that the deputy Commissioner took sides, a report was sent up to Government wherein it was stated that though the existing practice may be justified on grounds of manool, the arrangement was likely to lead to Constant schisms and some amicable ~~settlement~~ adjustment seemed desirable and what may be done in this direction would

called for by Government to the manner in which the Utsava took place in the year 1927 having been furnished the Communication was recorded in G.C. No. 146/Inuz. 274-26-9 W dated 22nd July 1929.

4. As regards the appeal referred to in para one supra, the Sub Divisional Officer of Canacona who conducted the enquiry and giving to the parties opportunities to adduce evidence, came to the conclusion that the Brahmins had the right to worship the Gauladevata on the Rathotsava day and on ceremonial and festive occasions and that no reliable, disinterested and independent evidence oral or documentary was forthcoming from the of the Luigayet to disprove this right.

In submitting the above the Deputy Commissioner stated in his letter dated 27th August 1926 that the

Case

case had already been dealt with by him fully and that he had nothing more to add.

A further hearing of the case which had been posted to 28-4-1928 was adjourned from time to time and as, on the final date of hearing, viz; 27th November 1928, the petitioner Y. P. Mallappa and others prayed for an adjournment and the respondents also absented themselves the appeal was dismissed in this office order D, Dis. No. 140/29- dated 5th December 1929.

On 2nd January 1930, the appellant presented a petition representing that on the last date of hearing they were seriously ill and could not therefore be present and prayed that the appeal may be restored, as otherwise they lost all chance of arguing the case.

The case came on for final hearing on 25th February 1930 when both the parties were present. The appellants were also

Sarathi, Advocate. The were

Order.

There is much force in the feeling of the Lingayets that as the temple depends for its maintenance on the Lingayets and is practically a Lingayet temple it is not fair to them to allow precedence to Brahmins on certain occasions but however much I might sympathise with this very proper aspiration, the mamool seems to be otherwise. As mamool decides by me already it is not open to me to go behind the order of Government of the 7th March 1923 which accepted the finding of the deputy-Commissioner (Mr. K. Mylar Rao) that during Rathotsava the Brahmins have the exclusive right of worship as per mamool from the time the deity is brought to the Ranga mantapa till the deity is seated on the car and the car is dragged a few paces. Certain mamools came into existence ~~where~~ when there were certain sections of the people who are unable to assert their rights, while there are others who on account of their education and

And forwardness obtain certain privileges
When the former rise to their proper level
much discontent and heart-burning
becomes very pronounced when they
begin to feel a spirit of humiliation
It is for the Brahmins to recognize this
and be more tolerant in view of altered
Circumstances but both parties are
equally obstinate. Though if the matter were
open I should have thought that in
view of the predominately Buddhist
character of the institution even if
the Brahmins had acquired certain pri-
vileges they should not be exercised
to make another important religious
sect feel a sense of inferiority and
ordered suitable arrangements to remove
the bitterness caused by the present
anomalous state of affairs I feel myself
precluded from taking this course by the
previous history of the case and the orders
I am reluctantly compelled to reject the appeal

"Copy"

(Sd) P.G. D'Souza
Muzrai Commissioner

To
The Manager, Office of the Muzrai
Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore

Do ready on 27-10-30

Do delivered on

No: of words 950

Copying fee 1-4-0

Comparing 0-3-4

Cost of paper 0-0-5

Copied by Kuruba

Compared by S. Jayaramaiah

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF

THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE, BANG

-:oOo:-

Muz;Appeal No: of 30-31

****

Appellants:-
Y.P.N.MALLAPP

AND OTHERS.

--:(VS):--

RESPONDENTS:-

NADIGARA RAMANNA AND

OTHERS.26.

REGARDING THE TEMPLE OF MALLI
KARJUNA SWAMY AT PURA, YAGATI

K A D U R.

FILED ON :-

H.G.

FILED BY:-

MR :C.PARTHASARATHY, B.A., B.L.

A D V O C A T E.

Copy of Official Memorandum No.1150/30 __31 dated 20/22nd January 1931 from the Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore, Bangalore, to the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District.

====

The marginally noted petitioners having filed in appeal before Government against the order of this office, in Muzrai Appeal No. 19/29_30 in the matter of offering worship to Sri Subramanyaswami temple at Yegatimma in the Kadur Taluk on the annual Rathotsava, records have been called for by the Financial Secretary to Government. The Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District is requested to submit at an early date, the entire records connected with the case for submission to Government.

1. Y.P.Mallappa, Son of Patel Nanjey Gowda, Pura, Yegate Hobli, Kadur Taluk.
2. N.L.Sivalingappaiah and others.

No.AE.1446/30. Office of the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District,
Encl. 1. Pet. Dated, Chikmagalur, 26th January 1931.

Memo.

Copy forwarded to the Sub Division Officer, Tarikere with the enclosed petition in original filed before Government for submission of the entire records connected with the above case sent with this office No.AE.306/29 dated 29/9/1930 at an early date.

for Deputy Commissioner,
Kadur District.

M.M.S.

861-30
Encs.

forwarded to the Amildar, Kadur Taluk, for immediate submission of the entire Records connected with the above Case immediately as

Sub Div. Officer
Tarikere

3.

The entire records are
A kind reference is solicited to
of the petition presented to Govt
D. Lines
sent by regd. post
dt. 2.31. TC 7015.

S2-861-30 Kadur
Enc. four files —

Submitted of the Deputy Commissioner
Kadur District.

The Entire file of records received with the
above is herewith submitted.

Chandrachudra Rao

Dt. 2.2.31 Subdivn. offr
Tarikere

16357

SIGNED BY:-

NAME :C. PARTHASARATHY, B.A., B.L.

ADVOCATE

App. F. G. 9]

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE.

GEN. & REV. SECRETARIAT.

Suit 206-30 2— OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No. 1569 Inc on file

16-1-31 The accompanying Petition Registered

No. 882 ..... dated 1-12-30

received at the General and Revenue

Secretariat from Messrs P. N. Mallappa & Sons N. M. Siddalingappa to allow ~~the~~ the matter of Official worship to Sri Kaccilleswara Swami at Yaganapura in the Kadur Tk on the Annual Rathotsava day etc.

To be sought for & returned.

is forwarded, together with its enclosures

to the M. C.

.....

.....for favourable of the Case stated & obs. with a report on the points raised in the petition

By Order,

13.1.31

for Secretary

Accepted

BANGALORE,

..... 19.....

[P. T. O.

141/31

WD 02048 -GPB—3750—8 8-28

.....ಹೋಬಳಿ

.....ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿರುವ

.....ಗೆ

ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್ಮೆಂಟ್.

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

.....

ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನೀವು ಗುಜರಾಯಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ .....

ಮೆರ್ಕ್ಯಾಮಿನ ಅರ್ಜಿಯನ್ನು..... .....ಬಗ್ಗೆ

.....

.....ರವರ ಬಳಿಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿದೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು.

By Order,

Secretary.

14 MAR 1931

OFFICE OF THE MUZRAI COMMISSIONER IN MYSORE,

Bangalore, 14th March 1931.

GENL. & REV. SECRETARIAT 16 MAR 1931 1233 MUZRAI.

FROM

S. P. RAJAGOPALACHARI, ESQ., B.A., B.L.,
Muzrai Commissioner in Mysore.

To

Rajasevaparayana
B. Srinivasa Iyengar, Esq., B.A., B.L.,

Secretary to Government of His Highness
the Maharaja of Mysore,
Financial *Department.*

SIR,

As desired in your official memorandum No.1540/ M2.30-- -3 dated 13/14th January 1931, I have the honour to submit herewith, the entire records connected with the offering of worship to Sri ------ Mallikarjunaswami at Yagatapura in the Kadur Taluk, on the annual ---- Rathotsava day, received with the Deputy Commissioner's letter No.1446 3- dated 12th February 1931.

This office file bearing No. ~~Appeal 19~~ R Dis 98/30-31 is also enclosed

The appeal petition received with the official memorandum -- referred to above is herewith returned.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

Yoganarasimha Rau

~~For~~ Muzrai Commissioner.
(absent from station)

Appendix F G—1

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to.....

Section Mu3

File No. 206-30

Serial No. 4.

No.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the 193 .

To

Messrs Y. P. N. Mallappa

Son of Patel Nanjeg

N. M. Sivalingappa Chetti

Pura, Yagati Hobli

Kadur Tk

Date of issue 7/1

Signed by.....

With ref^ce to their ~~appeal~~ pet^n

dt 1.12.30 appealing again

the orders of the M.C. in

the matter of opening

work to Sri Malleswara

Swamy at Yagati Pura.

Kadur Tk on the annual

Rathotsava day,

Messrs Y. P. N. Mallappa

N. M. Sivalingappa ~~Chetti~~

Orders are ~~to be informed~~

directed to [illegible]

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

WD 02559—GPB—25,000—25 6-30

~~Ex~~ an authenticated Copy
of the Judgment in O.S. No
59 of 1865 of Kadirur
Civil Court referred to in Para VIII of
Petn

B.

6.4.31
For Secretary
Revenue Dept

GO 2200 Dt 7
Copy of the above is forwarded
with Compliments to Mr. C.
Padmanabhan BA. B.L. Advocate
for the appellants for information.

B. O

6.4.31
For Secretary
Revenue Dept

G.S Cl
6/4

For R.C.

To

The Government of his Highness The Maharajah of Mysore,
General & Revenue Secretariate,
BANGALORE.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No.2199/206-30-4 dated 7th April 1931, we beg to forward an authenticated copy of the judgment in O.S. 59 of 1865 of Kadur Taluk Civil Court in the matter offering worship to Sri Mallikarjuna Swami at Nagatipura, Kadur Taluk.

586

~~KADUR~~, Shimoga
Date, 7-5-1931.

We beg to remain,
Sir,
Yours obediently,
B. M. C. Aradya.

0 ANNAS MYSORE ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

ಕೆ ಡೂರು ಕೌ ಟ್ಲೋ ಕು ಸಿವಿಲ್ ಕೋರ್ಟ್ ಜ್ಯೋಕುಲು ನಾಮ

1865 నేలయింది అదలు నంబరు 59

See Sheet

వా ది :- మురదళ్ళ ఎంబరువ ఓబేరంకమురద రుద్రప్పనవగ

ఒక్క న్న ఖు నెయ్య్ .

ప్రతివాదీరు :- ఇదే గ్రామదల్లి ఇరువ 1 నే ముద్దనయ్య్ .

(2) రేవయ్య . (3) మురళ్ళ సిద్దయ్య .

వాదీ నామ కౌ క్వయుక్ :- కన్నఒక్క ప్పనాద మరుంకయ్యనే మామ

లనిందనతదు ఖుందయుఖచి 1. ముర 2. అంకర కచ్చే రుళ్ళ కి

మళ్ళ ముర 4 . యిగ్రామదళ్ళ మచద అయ్యకెనద కేలనకొను నోరు

క్కా యిరువాగ్యే ప్రతివాదీరు 3 వరు ఋదింద ఆక్రమిసికొండు తనగే

బరకక్క యిభాబు కొమ్మ మల్లికార్జునదేవశోనదల్లి బర

కక్క నోంమ్మనీరు కేగదుకొండు ఇదాకే నాల 1 క్కె తిరూంపోయి ప్ర

కో రగిరూంపోయి కొండిదనుళ్ళకేంకదా మా మాడిదుజు వాంకి బిగ్గ —

1843 నే ఇల్లి కడూరు కౌట్లోకు సివిల్ కోర్ట్ ధనిగే నంబరు ప్లేగే

లు నకలు 1. మిజ్ఞా జనరు బరదించిబిం నాం ప్రత్రద దకలు ని ఫా

జరు మూడి వచ్చు 17 నొ షీ కోరిదానే .

ప్రతివాదీరజవాబు :- మూరళ్ళ కొల లాంగాయ్ము మబద్దయ్య

ఈనద హక్కు కేమదొంగిరుతెగ్గదే నోంమ్మ యింకి ష్టయ్యంబు .

నిజంద నే

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copyin sheets supplied on

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

MYSORE

ನಿಬಂಧನೆ ಯಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಕೌಪುಯಮಾರಂದಲು ನಿಬಂಧನೆ ಆನಿ ಶೆಪಿದು
ರೀಮಂಡುಯಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಶಿಷ್ಟಜನರು ಯಿಷ್ಟ ದಿಂದಾ ಕೊಂಚ್ಚದಷ್ಟಿ ನೀ ಕೊಗ
ದು ಪೋಂಡು ಕೆಲಪ ನಡಿನಿ ಇದೇಮೆ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ದಾಮಾಕ್ರ ಕೌರಮೆಂಬ
ಲನು ಮೋಡು ಮುದಕೆ ಕೌರಣಾ ವಿಲ್ಲಾ. ಶೆಪುಲ್ಲಕು ಕ್ಕು ದಾರಿ ಬಿನ್ನೆ 17
ನಾಂಪ್ಲೀ ಶೆನಿಖೆ ಆಗಬೇಡಿಂಚ ಮನ್ನೆಲಿಖರಿನಿ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. (ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡಿಲ್ಲ
ಆದ್ರ ಇನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ ನಾವು ನಿಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದೇವೆ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಿ)
ಶೆನಿಖೆ ನಂಗ್ರಹ :- ಪಾದಿಖೆ ನ್ನಬನಯ್ಯ, ಪ್ರಶಿ ಮಾದೀರ 3ಜನ ಇವರ
ಕಡೆ ವಕೀಲರುದ್ರಿಯ್ಯ. 1 ಮಾದೀಕರಪ್ಪ. ನಾಪಿ 17ಜನರಪ್ಪೆಕಿ ಮಂದಿ
ರಾಜರು ಮೂಡದೆ ಕೆವ್ವಿದ 3ಜನರವಿನರ 1ನೇ ವಿರಭದ್ರಣ್ಣ 2ನೇ
ವಿರಣ್ಣ 3ನೇ ಮೆಚಂಣ. 4ನೇ ಕಾಮುಭೋಗಿಂಮಪ್ಪ. 5ನೇ
ಚಂಕಚನಾರಣಪ್ಪ. 6ನೇ ಯುಗವಿಮಲ್ಲೇನಾಂಡ 10ನೆ ಕೆ-ರಿ ನಾಗಣ.
11ನೆ ಲಂಕೆರಕಚೆ ರುಳಿಬನಪ್ಪ. 12ನೇ ನಿರಿನಾಂಡ 13ನೇ ಯಳ್ಳಂಬಿಳ
ಜೆ ಮರಳಯ್ಯನ್ನು. 14ನೇ ವಿರಪ್ಪ. 15ನೇ ನಂಜಂಡಪ್ಪ. 16ನೇ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂಗಳ
ಮರಳಯ್ಯನ್ನು. 17ನುರು ನಂಜಿನಾಂಡ. ಯಿಂನೆ 14ಜನರು.
ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಕರಪ್ಪೆ. ನಾಪಿ 17ಜನರಪ್ಪೆಕಿ ಲವರು ರಾಜರು ಮೂಡದೆ ಕೆವ್ವಿದ
ಯಿನಿನಂ 1ಮೊಕಿ ಯಿನಂ 1ವಿನರು ಮಾಕಿ ಬೂಕಿ 1ನೇ ರುಣಾನೇ ಮುರವಮ
ಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ. 2ನೇ ಮುರಿಣಮ್ಮನ ಮಲ್ಲಣ 3ನೆಂಣಾ ಗಂಚಿಹಾ 4ನವರಾಮುರ
ಮಲ್ಲಂಣಾ 5ನೆ ಶೌಂಮಿ ಮಲ್ಲಣ 6ನೇ ಮೋಡಗಂಚಿಹಾ 7ನೆ ರವಿಕೆಂಣ 8ನೆಂಣ
ಮಲ್ಲಂಣಾ 10ನೆ ಲಗವನವಿರಣ್ಣ. 11ನೇ ಣಿಗರಕೆಂಚೆ 12ನೆ ರುಂಕಣ್ಣ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Addi sheets

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

MYSORE

13 ದೇವರಮನೆ ಭದ್ರಯ್ಯ 14 ಮೆಂಕಚ ನಾರಣಪ್ಪ. 15 ಹೊನ್ನು
ಜೋಗನಾರಣಪ್ಪ. (16) ಮರದ ನಂಜಯ್ಯ ಹಿಂಗೆ 15 ಜನರು.
ಈರೀತಿ 34 ಜನರನ್ನು ಖೆಂಯಿಂದಲೂ ಪಾಂಡಿಯಿಂದ ಹಾಜರು
ಆದ ದಾಖಲೆಗಳು.

1 ಮುದದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಾದಜಮೀನಿನ ಕಚ್ಚೀಲು ಪುಳ್ಳ ಪಾಲಿನ ಅಮಲು ಪಟ್ಟದ
ನಕಲು.
2 ಶ್ರೀ ಹಿಂಡ್ಲೆಯ ಮರಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾದಿ ಪ್ರೊಂಶಿಕರು ಬರಕೊಂಡದ್ದಂಬ
ಕ್ರೈಕೊಂಡದ ನಕಲು. —
3 ಯಿ ಹಿಂಡ್ಲಯನ ಮುಚಲಿಂದ ಬಕ್ಕೆಜನರಿಗೆ ಬಂದದ್ದಂಬ
ನಿರೂಪಿನ. — 4 ನೇ ಈ ಮುಚಲ್ಕೆ ಶಿಷ್ಯನಾದ ಹಿಂಗನ ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನಹಿಂದಿ
ಶೋರಿ ವಹಿಬ್ಬಿನಕಲು. 5. ಪಾದಿಕಂದಿಹಿಕ್ಕರಿಗೆ ಶಾನುಭೋಗ —
ರಿ ಮಲ್ಲಪ್ಪ ವಸ್ಸೆಕೇರು ಬರದಕೊಂಡದ ನಕಲು.
6 ಪಾದಿಕಂದಿ ಹಿಕ್ಕರಿಗೆ ಯುನಲಿ ಗ್ರಾಮುನ್ಯರು ಬರದ ಕೊಂಡದ ನಕಲು
7. ಸ್ಥಳಕ್ಕೆ ಬರಚೋಕೆಂದ ಶಿಷ್ಯಜನರು ಬರದ್ದೆಂಬ ಕೊಂಡದ ನಕಲು 2.
ಇವು ಸಳ್ಳನ್ನು ಪಾದಿಕೊಂಡದ 43 ನೇ ಯಿನ್ನಿಕ ಸಿ ಅಸಲು ಕರಿಬಿನದಾ ಖೆಯ್ಕೆ ಪಡ
ಎಬಿ ಕ್ಕಲಿಸಿ ದಾಖಲು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಪ್ರೊಂಶಿ ತಿಂಗಳ ಸಳ್ಳಲ್ಲಾ ಸೋಡುಪೊಸ್ಸ
ಲಿಖುರದ ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಚಿಕ್ಕರಂಚಿ ಮುಚಲ್ಕೆ ಯೀವಿಷಂದದ
ಪುರಂಯುನಲಿ ವಸ್ಸೆಕಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಸಳ್ಳ ಮುಚದಯ್ಯಲೆ ನವು ಶೋರಿ ಲಿಮುಚ
ಯಿರುವಲ್ಕೆ ಯಿಯಂತೆಲೂ ಯಿದಕ್ಕೆ ಮೂಲಪುರುಷ ಚಿಕ್ಕರಂಚಿ ಬಿಚ್ಚಸ್ಥ

ಮೈಂಡಿಯರು

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

0 ANNAS MYSORE ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

ಮೈ
ತಯರು ಇವರಿಗೆ ವಿಜಿನ ಮಕ್ಕಳು 1ನೇ ಪ್ರಭುದೇವರು. 2ನೇ
ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ. 1ನೇ ಪ್ರಭುದೇವರಮಗ ನಡದಜೋವರು. ಎಂಬ
ನಮ್ಮ ಹಿರಿಮಗ ಮುಚ್ಚಮ್ಮಯಾನೆ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನವಿರಜೆವರು 2ನೇ ಚಿಕ್ಕ
ಮಗ ಪ್ರಭುವ 3ನೇ ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪ 4ನೇ ನಡದಜೋ. 5ನೇ ವಿರಭದ್ರಂಗಳು ಈ
ಮೈಗಳಿ 1.2.4.5 ಈ 4ಜನರು ನಷ್ಟವಾಂತಲಿ 3ನೇ ರುದ್ರಪ್ಪನು-
1ನೇ ಮಗ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ ವೀರಜೋವರು ಹೊಲ ಚಿಲ್ಲರಂತಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿಜ್ಜದಾನೆ
2 ನೇ ಮಗ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನಬಸಪ್ಪ ಹೊಲ ಮಾಡಿಯಾಗಿ ನಿಜ್ಜದಾನೆ. 3ನೇ
ಮಗ ರಾಚಪ್ಪ ಮೂಲ ಹುರುಷನ 2ನೇ ಮಗ ಮಹಾಂತಯ್ಯನ
ನ ವಿಜಿನ ಮಕ್ಕಳಾಗಿ ಮೈಗಳಿ 1ನೇ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನಪ್ಪ ಇವನ ಮಗ
ಮ ಹಂಚಯ್ಯ 43ನೇ ಯಿನ್ನಿ ಮೈಗಳಿಲದಾರ - 2ನೇ ಪ್ರಭುಜೋವ
ರು 3ನೇ ಚಿಕ್ಕ ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ ಹೊಲ ಯಿಲ್ಲ 3ಜಂತಲಿಯು ನಷ್ಟಗಳಿ
43 ನೇಯಿನ್ನಿ ಮೈಗಳಿಲದಾರ ಮಹಾಂತಯ್ಯನು ಇವನನೇ ಚಿಕ್ಕಪ್ಪನಾ
ಗಿ ಚೇಲಕೊಂದರಿಂದಾ ಹೊಲ ತಂದು ಉಳ್ಳದಾರನಾಗಿಯಿದ್ದಾನೆ.
ನ ಡ ನಡ ಜೋವರಿಗೆ ಸೊಕ್ಕು ಪರಿಂತಾದ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನ್ನ
ಯಂ ಬುವ 1824 ನೇಯಿನ್ನಲೊರಣ ನೆ 1 ವರಿಗೆ ಮುಟ್ಟದಯ್ಯನ
ನ ಡ ದೆಲ್ಲ ನಮ್ಮಂತಿ ಮೈಗಳಿ ಆದಾಂ ಅನಂತ್ರ ನಡ ದವರು ಚಿಕ್ಕ
ಪ್ಪ ನ ಮಗ ನಾದ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನಕೊ - ಅವನಿಕ್ಕಪ್ಪ ಲೆ ಅವನ ಮಗನಾ
ದ ನ ದರಿ ಮೈಗಳಿಲದಾರ ಮಹಾಂತಯ್ಯನ್ನ ಈ ಮೇರಿಗೆ ಲಂಗಾ

ಯಿತಿನಂಡಲು

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

ಲಂ ಗಾಂಯಿರಿ ನಿಂದಲೂ ಚಿಕ್ಕೆರಂಚಿನಿ ಅಯ್ಯಲೆನವು ಕೆಂಪ್ಪ
ಮೈ ನಾದವಚೆಟ್ಟಿ ಕೆಂಮ್ಮವರಿ ಮುಟದ ಅಯ್ಯಲೆನವು ನೋ
ಡಿ ಬಂದಿದಾಕೆ. 43 ನೇ ಯನ್ನಯುಲ ಕ್ಕೈಕ್ಷಲ ಚಿದ ಮೆಲಿ 3ವ
ರುಷ್ಟದಿ ನಂತರ ನಿದರಿ ಮಹಾಂತಯ್ಯನನು ದೇವನೊನದ
ಶ್ಯನಿ ಕರಿಸು ಮನಕ್ಕೊಚ್ಚುಂಬಂದಿ ನಿಕ್ಕಂಗಡವಾಂಯಿರು
ಎಂಬೆಂಬಲು ಎಮ್ಮಲಿಚಿನೆ ಗ್ರಾಮನ್ನಕಾದಳುಣಿಶೆಮುಲದಮಲ್ಲಿಯ್ಯ
ಪಟೆಲಗನೋಳ್ಳ ಮುಲಯ್ಯನಯಿಗಚಿ ಮುಳ್ಳಿಗವಡಾ ಶಾನು
ಚ್ಚೇಲಗ ಕಿಂಮ್ಮಡಿಕೊ ಮುಂತೊಂದ ಪರು ಗ್ರಾಮುಲಕಿ ಶ್ರೀಘ್ರನೀಚು
ರ ಪ್ಪು ಡಾರು ನಕ್ಕಳಕೆ ಬಿರಬೀಲಕಿಂಕ ಕ್ಕೋಳ್ಳಲುಕೆರಿನೆಟಾಂದಿ
ಈಂದಿ ರುದ್ರಪ್ರಜನ ಮುನಿರಿನು ಮಾದಿಲಣ್ಣ ಚಿಕ್ಕೆರಂಚಿಚೆಂಪ್ಪಮೀರ
ಬೀಲಪರಿನು ನಕ್ಕೂ ಕೆಂಡಿಕವಾಂಗಿ ನಿ-3 ದೊನದನಳ್ಳಿ ಬಿರದ
ದಿಂದಲೂ ಕ್ಕೋಳ್ಳಲು ಕೆಳಿ ಯಿಂದಲೂ ಕ್ಕೈಂಪ್ಪಳ ನೆಂಬದಲ್ಲಿ
ಪರ ಗ್ರಾಮುಲಕಿ ಬಿಂದು ನಿವಾರು 3-4 ವರುಷ್ಟಚಲಿನು
ಮದದ ಅಯ್ಯಲೆನದ ಕೆಲನಿವು ನೋಡಿ ಬೀಲಕ್ಕೊನದಲ್ಲಿ
ಬಿರಕ್ಕರು ನುಂವಕ್ಕೊಕೆ ಕೆನಿದು ಕೊಂಡು ಬಂದಿ ಯ್ಯಲಿಕಿನೆ
ಮು ಕ್ಕೆಲಮು ಮನಕ್ಕೊಚ್ಚ ಮುಂಲಕೆಚ್ಚಿಚ್ಚೆಪುಂಚಿಂಗಿ ನಿಕ್ಕಂಗಡ
ವಂಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿರು ನಿನೆ ಚಿಂಗಡದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇರಿಕೊಂಡು ಮಚದ
ಅಂಯ್ಯಲೆನದ ಕೆಲನಿವು ನಡಿಪಿ ಕೊಂಮ್ಮನಕ್ಕು ಚೆಗದುಕೊಂಡು

ನಿವಾಂಕೆ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional sheets supplied

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

ಅಂಬಾ ದೇವಿ. 43ನೆ ಯಿಷ್ಟಿ ಪ್ರೈಷಲೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದಂತೆ ಮುಕ್ತಿನಂಜ್ಞ
ರ ಕ್ಷಿ ದಾರನಲ್ಲಿ ಮೆಂಕೆ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಅವನಾಂಗುಲಾನು
ಶಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳ ವಶಂ ತಿರುಪಂಚೆ ನಮೂದಯಿದ್ದು ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿರೋಧ
ವಾಗಿ ಮನರಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯು ಪಚ್ಚು ಯಿರುವದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಪನ್ನ
ರ ಕ್ಷಿಕನಸಿ ದ್ವಿರವಪಡಿಸಿ ಪ್ರಕಟಿಸಿದೀರು ಪೆಳದು ದೊಂಡಿರುವ
ವಿಷಯಂ ಮ್ಯಾದಮೊಂಬಲನು ಅವರಿಂದಲೂ ಕೊಂಡ್ಯಿಬೇ —
ರೆಂಕೆಲ್ಲು ಮೆಲನಮೂದಾದ ಇಕೆನ್ನ ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನಕ್ಕು ಹೆಳಿಂದ
ಮೇಲೆ ಅಕನಹೆಂಡ್ತಿಯು ನಿಕ್ಕು ಹೆಳಿಂದ್ದರಿಂದಲೂ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗೆ
ಯಿಷ್ಟಿ ಕಲ್ಪಿಸಲ್ಪಮಚಕೆ ಹೇರಿಯಿರುಕ್ಕದೆಂಕೆ ವಸ್ಕೆಲೆ ವಾದಿ —
ಪಕ್ಷದವಾನೆ.

2— ವಾದಿ ತರಪಿ ಕೌಸೆಲಿ ಕನಿ ಖಳಿನಿ ಇಗುವ 14ನೆನರು ವಾದಿಪ್ಪಳ್ಳಿ
ನೆ ಅನುಷಂಠರವಾನಿ ಹೇಳ್ಳಿದಾಕೆ. ಯೀ ಜ್ಯೆಕೆ ಕೆಲವಲ 60-70 ವರುಷ
ಗಳ ಕೆದಿಂರಾನಿ ಇರುವಕಾನುಚೇನೆಕರಿಮ್ಮಕ್ಕಾ। ಯನುನಚಿ
ಮುಲ್ಲಿ ನವತ 2 ಯುಳ್ಳಂಬಿಳ್ಳಿಚೆ ಮುರಳ್ಳಿ ನವತಾಂತೆ ಯೀಗನ
ರು ಪ್ರತ್ಯಕ್ಷವಾಗಿ ಕಂಠಂತೆ ಹೇಳ್ಳುವದಾಜ್ಞೆಗಳ್ಳಿಂದ್ಲಾಂಗಾಯಿ
ನಿಂರೂಂ ವಾದಿ ಪೈಂಪಿನಿ ತರಿ ರಕ್ಷಿ ದಾರ ಯುಂಕೆಲೂ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂ
ದುಲ್ಲಿಯ್ಯ ಯುಂಬುವ ಯೀ ಮುರಳ್ಳಿ ತಿಪ್ಪಿವಾದವಾನೆಂಕ್ಷ
ಯಿಳೆ ಮುಕ್ಕು ಹೆಂಡ್ತಿ ದೇರ ನಿಕ್ಕು ಹೆಳಿಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬಾಮೈದನ

ಕಡಿಮುರಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional sheets supp

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by



ಕಡಿ ಮಿಡಿ ಬಹಳ ಕಿನ ವಹಂಳ್ಕಿ ವಿಕ್ಕಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನ ಮುಳ್ಳಯ್ಯನ
ಸಿಂ ಗಿಯು ಲ್ಲಿ ಅಮಲ್ಲಮುಚಕ್ಕೆ ಹೈರಿಯಿರುಚ್ಚಿ ಡಿಂಕಿಲಚ್ಚಿ
ಈ ಚಿಕಿಸಿಂದಿ ಮೈಲ್ಕಿಕಿಕ ಚಿಕ್ಕನಿಂ ಮಾಡಂಕಂಯ್ಯ ಕಿದುಚಿಂ
ಯ ಲಂದಿ ಸಿ ಹಾ ಮುಚದ ಲಯ್ಯಕಿನ ನಿಮೂರಿಬಂದಿ ದ್ದಾರೆಂಕಲು
ಸು ಮಂಡು 1841 ನೇಲಂಯ್ಸ ಶೋರ್ಕರಿ ನಿಂ ಗ್ರಾಮು ಪ್ರ ವಿಂಗಡ
ಚಾ ದ್ರಿಂದಿಂದ್ಲಾ ವಿನೈಕಿಂಗಡದ ವರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವಿಸಿಂದಿ ಮುವಿನಯ್ಯ
ಶೆಂ ಡಿಕ್ಕಿಂತು ಲಯ್ಯಕಿನದ ಕೆಲಸಿಕಿನ ನಡ್ಡಿನದಿಕ್ಕೆ ಲಿಸ್ಯೆಯಿದ
ಚಂ ದಿ ಮೈಲ್ಕಿಕಿಕ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನ ಪಿಕಿನ ಮುದ ಮು ಹಾಂಕಿಕಂಯ್ಯ ನು 1843
ಸಿ ಲಯ್ಯಂತುಲ್ಲ ದಾಮಾ ಮೂಂಡಿ ಪ್ಪೈಕಿಲ ವಿಡದ ನಿಂಕಲು ಪ್ಪೈಕಿನ
ಲ ಪ್ಪಿ ರಿತ ಲವರುಪ್ಪ ನಡಿಯಲು ಪ್ಪು ನಾ ಹಿಂ ಗ್ರಾಮು ಯಿಚಂಡ
ಚಂ ನಿವುಪ್ಪೈಲಿ ಮೈಲ್ಕಿನ್ನ ಮಾದ ಹಾಗು ಲಯ್ಯಚಿಕಿನ ಪ್ಪು ನಿಕಿನ ಪ್ರ -
ಯಿ ಕಿಂಡ ಮಾದಿ ಲವರಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರವಿಸಿಂದಿ ಶೋರ್ಕರಿ ಡಿಕ್ಕಿಂತು ಚೆಲ್ಲಮಿಗ
ಡ ನಿಪ್ಪೈ ಇಕುವ ಹಾನಿ ಚೆಯ್ಯಂಗರು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ——————
3 — ಯಿಲ್ಲಿ ಚಿಕ್ಕರಂಕ ಮುಚಕ್ಕೆ ಪುಚ್ಚಾರದ ನಮಿಸ್ಸನು ಪಿಂದಿ ನವಿ
ನಂ ಲಂ ನಂ 1 ರೆ ಮಿ ಲೆ ಲಿಖ್ಖಿದಪ್ಪಿ ನಿವಿಚಾರಣ ಚಿಕ್ಕಗಂಪ್ಪಿ ಮುಚ್ಚಿ
ಲಂ ಲಂಕ ನಮ್ಮೂ ದಾನಿ ಲಂ ಮೀ ಹಾಗು ಕೆದಿಂ ಪಿಡ್ಡಾ ಕೆದ
ಚಾ ಕೆಂ ಬಲ್ಲೇರಿಲ್ಲ ಕ್ಕು ಲಿಚ್ಚುಮಿಲ್ಲ ಗಳ್ಳಿಲ್ಲ ಮುಚಕ್ಕ
ಚಿಂ ನ್ನಕ ನಷ್ಟಿನಿದೆ 1/2 ವ್ಯರಥ ಚಿಕ್ಕಂನ್ನ ಮುಳ್ಳಯ್ಯನ

ಕ್ಕಂನಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on th

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

MYSORE

ಹೆಸರಿನ ಒಳಗೆ ವರಹಾ ಎಂಬ ಪದವು ಸೇರಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಸುಮಾರು ಹದಿನೈದು ಮೈಲಿ ದೂರದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳು ಎಂಬ ಗ್ರಾಮವಿದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ದೂರ ಹೋದರೆ ಹೆಬ್ಬಾಳು ಕೆರೆಯ ಏರಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರುವಿರಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on	Additi sheets

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

MYSORE

ಕೆಲಕ ನೋಡಕ ಕೆಕ್ಕದು ಜೋಕಿಸಾಮದಲ್ಲಿಯು ಮಂಮೂಲ ಯಿಕುವದಾಗಿ ಮಾದಿಕರವಿ ಧದರಿಮುರಳ್ಳೆ ಸವತ್ತಾ ಗುರುನಂಜೆ ಗವತಾಸಿ ನಂಜುಂಡ್ಯೆಯ್ಯನ್ನ ೩. ಚಿಕಿಕ್ಕಂಗಳ್ಳದ ಮುರಳ್ಳಯ್ಯನ್ನ ೪. ಹಿಂಗೆ ೪ ಜನರಿಂದಾ ರುಜು ಮಾನಿಯಿ ಬೆ. ೫ - ಮಾನಿ ಕೊಂಡುವ 1843 ನೆಯಿನ್ನ ಅನಲು ನಂಬ್ರುಕಿನ್ನ ಕಿಚ್ಚು ನೋಡಕರು ಮಾನ್ನ ಇದೆ ಮುಚ್ಚದ ಅಯ್ಯನವನ ನೋಂಮ್ನ ನೋಡಕ್ಷರ ಮಾದಿ ಮೈಸೂಕಿನ ಮಹಾಂಮಯ್ಯನು ಇದೆ 1ನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಶಿಮಾದಿ ಮುಖಿನಯ್ಯನ ಮೇಲೆ ದಾಮಾಮೂಲಿ ಧದನೆಂಗಿ ಯಿಲ್ಲ ಪ್ರತಿಮಾದಿಯಂಮು ಕೊನು ಯಿದಕ್ಕೆ ಇಂಥಾ ದ್ದನಲ್ಲಾ ಮಾದಿ ಹಾಜ್ರಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಯಿದ್ದ ಕೊರಣಾ ದಿಂದ್ದು ಕೊನು ಜಂದಮು ನೋದದ್ರಿಂದ್ದು ನಿಜಭಕ್ತ ಜಂಗಿಜನಕಾಲು ಕೆನಿನೆ ರೆರ ವಿದ್ರಿಂದ್ದು ಅಲರಲ್ಲಿ ಹವ್ವಕಿವ್ವ ಕೊನು ಕೆಲಕಾಶಿದ್ದು ಬಂಟು ಯಿಂಕ ಹೇಳ್ಳುಕ್ಕನೆ ಕ್ಷಿದಿಂಜನರ ಕೆನಿಜೆವಕ್ಕೆಯಿಂದ್ದು ಮಾದಿಯಂ ಮುಚ್ಚದ ಅಯ್ಯನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಜ್ಜುದಾರನೆಂಬುವುದು ನ್ನ ಪ್ಪಮಾನುವದರಿಂದ್ದು ಮ್ಯಾಂದೂ ಪ್ರತಿಮಾದಿ ಪ್ರೇಕ್ಷಕವಾ ರ ಕಾರದೆಂಕ್ಕೆ ಆನಿನಂಮಲದಾರ ಹೊಂಡಮ್ಯೆಯ್ಯನವರು 1843 ನೇಯಿನ್ನ ಶಕಪಟಂಬರಕ್ಕೆ ಕೊಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಿಮುದ್ರೆ ಮಾಡಿದಾರೆ ಪ್ರತಿಮಾದಿನೆಲದೆಯಿನ್ನ ಶಕಪಟಂಬರ 30ನ್ನೆ

ಕೊಂಡಿಕೆನಲ್ಲಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on th

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS
MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

ತೊಂಡಿ ಖಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಪೈಸಲ ನಕಲು ಪಿಂಪಚಿ ಆಗಿಂತಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ —
ರಶೀದಿ ಹಾಜ್ರು ಯಿದೆ. ಆದ್ರ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಿಲು ಯಿಸುಮಾರ ತಲಿಲ್ಲಾ
ಆದರಿ ಯಿಲ್ಲಿ ಮೀಂಬದ ಮಾಂದಲ್ಲಿ ಕ್ರಿಶಿಮಾಡಿಯು
ತೀರ್ಮಾ ಬ್ಬು ಯಿರುವ ರಿಜಿಂತ್ರನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾದಿಯೋ ಆಗ್ಲಿಕಾನು
ಆ ನಿ ಯಿಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಚದ ಅಯ್ಯಕನಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕು ದಾರಲ್ಲಾ
ಜೋ ಎನ್ನವುಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ ಯೆಂಬವ ಹಕ್ಕು ದಾರಯಿದ ಅವಿದೆ
ಕು ಹೀಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಸ್ಥರು ತೆನ್ನ ದಿಂಗತವಾಂ
ಆ ಹಕ್ಕು ದಾರಂತ ನಮೂಂದಿಸಿ ಇದ್ದಾನೆ. ಹೀಂತಿರುವ ಆ ಜೋಂನ
ವುಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ ತೆನ್ನವೋಕ್ಕಸಿಕ ನೆಂಬೈ ಆಗಲಿ ಅವನೆಕ್ಕ
ಹೀಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ತೆಂನ್ನ ಹಿರಿಂಯರು ಅನುಭವವಾಂತಿದಿ —
ರಂಯುವದೆ ಆಗ್ಲಿಯೋ ನೆಂಂದು ಹೇಳಿಯಿಷ್ಟಿದಿಲ್ಲಾ —

6. — ಆದ್ರ ಮೀಂದಿನ ನೆದ್ರಿಕೈಗ್ಲಿ ಜಾಕ್ರನಳ್ಳಿ ಹೀಂಗಳಿದ
ತೆನ್ನ ಹೀಳ್ಳಿಯಂನೆ ನೋಕ್ರಶಿಮಾದಿಯು ಹಾಲಿಬದ್ದಾಗಿ
ಯಿಪಾನೆ ನಿವೆ ನಿನೋಕ್ರಶಿಮಾಡೋರು. ನೋಕ್ರಶಿಮಾದಿ ತೆಂಮಂ
ದಾದರ್ರಿಂದು ಅವನ ಹೀಳ್ಳಿನೆ ಅನುಸರಿಂಸಿ ಇದಾರೆ. ಮಾದಿಬಾ
ಬಕು ಹಿಕ್ಕಂತಿ ಮುಚದ ಮಿನಾ: ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಅಯ್ಯಕನಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ರಿ
ನ್ನೆಕ ಮುಟ ವೆಂತಿತ್ತಾ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಲಂಸಾಯಿತಿ ನಿಂದಿ ತಾಮ್ಮೆ
ಹಕ್ಕು ದಾರಿಂತಿಲು ಹೀಂನ್ನವುಲ್ಲಯ್ಯ ಯೆಂಬವ ತೆನ್ನ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Addi... sheets supplied on

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

ANNAS
MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಅವನು ದಿಕ್ಕಿಗೆ ಬೆಟ್ಟವು ಕ್ಕಿಂತ ವಿರಳವಾಗಿ ಮನೆಗಳು
ಇದ್ದವು. ಇವರು ಬೆಟ್ಟದ ಮೇಲೆ ಬೆಟ್ಟವು ಇಳಿಜಾರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುರಕ್ಷಿತವಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದ್ದ
ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಂಗಡಿಯನ್ನು ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದರು. ಮೇಲಿನ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ
ದೇವರ ಮಂಟಪ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಇವರಿಗೆ ೫೩ ವರ್ಷ ವಯಸ್ಸಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇವರಿಗೆ
ಮೂರು ಜನ ಗಂಡು ಮಕ್ಕಳು ಇದ್ದರು. ಇವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿ ಇವರಿಗಿಂತ ಹಿರಿಯಳು
ಆಗಿದ್ದಳು. ಇವರ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಮಾತ್ರ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರ ಮಕ್ಕಳು
ಮೂರು ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಬ್ಬನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಮದುವೆಯಾಗಿದ್ದನು. ಇವರ ಮಗನ ಹೆಸರು
ಮಾತ್ರ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರ ಮಗನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯ ಹೆಸರು ಸಹ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ.
ಇವರ ಮಗನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯು ಸಹ ಇವರ ಮನೆಯಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದಳು. ಇವರ
ಮಗನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯು ಸಹ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಳು. ಇವರ ಮಗನ ಹೆಂಡತಿಯು
ಇವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವ ಸಂಬಂಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಳು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರ ಮಗನ
ಹೆಂಡತಿಯು ಇವರಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಿಯಾಗಿದ್ದಳು ಎಂಬುದು ಮಾತ್ರ ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿದೆ.

೭. - ಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು ಮೊದಲಿಯಾರ್ ಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದ
ರು ಮುಖ್ಯ ಸ್ಥಳವಾಗಿದೆ. ನನಗೆ ಇವರು ಮೊದಲಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಪರಿಚಯ
ವಿದ್ದವರಾಗಿದ್ದರು. ಇವರು ಮೊದಲಿಂದಲೂ ಒಂದೇ ಬೀದಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸವಾಗಿದ್ದರು
ಇವರು ಯಾವ ಜಾತಿಯವರು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಯಾವ
ಜಾತಿಯವರು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೆಂದರೆ ಇವರು
ಅನ್ಯ ಜಾತಿಯವರಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರ ಜಾತಿಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಎಂದೂ
ಕೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಯಾವ ಜಾತಿಯವರು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ ತಿಳಿಯದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ
ಕಾರಣವೆಂದರೆ ಇವರು ಅನ್ಯ ಜಾತಿಯವರಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಇವರ ಜಾತಿಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು
ನಾನು ಎಂದೂ ಕೇಳಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಇವರು ಯಾವ ಜಾತಿಯವರು ಎಂಬುದು ನನಗೆ
ತಿಳಿಯದಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾರಣವೆಂದರೆ ಇವರು ಅನ್ಯ ಜಾತಿಯವರಾಗಿದ್ದರಿಂದ
ಇವರ ಜಾತಿಯ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಎಂದೂ ಕೇಳಿರಲ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

ಕಳ ಚೆಲಿ ನುದ್ರಿಷ್ಟಾ ಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವದರಿಂದಾ ನಿಜವೆಂಬ್ಕ

ಗ ಹಿಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಮಾನವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ವುಕ್ತಿಮೈಸ್ಕಾಕಾ

ಪ್ಪ ಯಲು ಕೆರಕ್ಟರ್ ಹಿಂದಿಚಾರ್ಧ್ಯಶೆಯಲು ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಯಿಲ್ಲ

ನು ಕಿಳ್ಳದವನಾಗಿಯಿಲ್ಲಾ - ನಿನೆ ಹೃಣಕ್ಕೆ ಮರದವುಲ್ಲ --

ಗ ಪಡಕ್ರಮಿಸಿಂದಿರಹಿಳ್ಳನೆ ಅನುಪಂಗಿಹೇಳಿದಾಗ್ಲೆ

ಈ ತನು ನಿನ್ನೇ ಪಿಂಗರಿಪ್ಪೆ ಪ್ರೀಕ್ಷನಾದವನೆಂಬೂ ನಿವ

ನಿಂದಲೆ ವ್ಯಾಜ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಕೆರಣವಾದ್ದಿಂಕಲೂ ೪೩ನೇ ನಿಬ್ಬಿ

ರಿಪ್ರಿಂಯಿಂದಾನವಲೂದಾಗುತ್ತದೆ

3- ನೇ ಮುದ್ದನಂಜಯ್ಯ ೩೬ವರುಷದವನಾಗಿಯಿದಾನೆ

ಚೆನ್ನಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನೆಂಬುವ ೪೦ವರುಷಕ್ಕೆ ಹಿಂದೆ ಪ್ರೀಮಿವಿಲಿಗ

ಯಿದ್ದೆನೆಂಕಲೂ ಅನಂತರ ಲೆಕ್ಕನಡಿಂತ್ತಿ ಹೇಳಿದಳೆಂಪ್ಪ

ಪಾಪವುಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿ ಈ ಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನೆರಬಿನಸಾಕ್ಷಿಗಳಿಂದ

ರುಜುವಾಗಿಯಿದೆ ಯಿಂತ್ಕೊಜೆಂನ್ನಮಲ್ಲಯ್ಯನಕಾಲಾನೆಳ್ಳಿದೆ

ಯಂಕಲೂ ಅವನುನಿಕ್ಕೆ ಇಕವರುಷವಾಗಬಹುದೆಂಕಲೂ

ಅವನಿರಿಂಕೆ ಮೊದಲೆ ಹಿಂತ್ತಿವಿಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋಗಿನಿಜಂಳುವೆಂಪ್ಪ

ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾನೆ. ಆದರಿಂದಾ ಇವನಕಾಲಿಯು ವುಂಟೂರಿನೆ

ಹೇಳಲು ಅನರ್ಹರಾಗಿಯಿದೆ. -- -- -- -- --

ಬಿಂಕಿಪಾಟೀಗಾರು ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಯಹೇಳ್ಳಗಿಪಾಯ

ವಾಗಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

TWO ANNAS
MYSORE
ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

ಪಾಸಿ ಹೋಳಿದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಇವಳಿಲ್ಲಾ ನನ್ನೇ ಕಂಗತದವರುಂಟಿನೆ ಹೋಗಿ
ದವರಿಂನಿಯಾಂದಾಳಿ

ಈ ಕೇಂಪ್ಲೇಟ್ಗೆ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಪಾಂಡಿನೋಂಗನ್ನರಹಿಕ್ಕಿಯಿರುವ
ಪ್ಲೈಸಲು ಗೆ

ರುಪ್ಪೆ ಪಾಂಚಿಸಳ್ಳು ಪ್ರೈಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ರೈಂದು ಪಾಳ್ಳೆ ಮೆಂಬಾಳ್ಳೆ
ಯಿಂದ ನಿಜವೆಂಕ ಕಿಳ್ಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಪಾಂಪಾಂಗಿನ್ನಿರುವೆವೆ.

43 ನೇ ಯಿನ್ನ ಡಿಕ್ರಿ ಮತ್ತು ಅಜೊಂಡ್ರ ಸಳ್ಳಿಂದಾಂ ನಿಕ ಹಾಲಿ
ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗಳು ಕೊಂಚು ಯಿರುವಜವಾಬುಂವರಕಡೆ ನಿಂದೆ—
ಯುವರಹೋಳ್ಳಿ ಪಹಸೇರುವಾಗೆ ವುಂಟು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು
ಹೋಳ್ಳುವ್ಯಾದೆಂಕ ಕಿಳ್ಳಿಯುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವಾಗಿದೆ. ಯುವ್ಯಾದಿ
ಕಾರಣಗಳ್ಳಿಂದ ದಾವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮೂ ದಾಸುವ ಮಾಡದ
ಂಯ್ಯಾವಸದಹಕ್ಕೆ ಗೂ ಇದರಿಂದ ಭಿರುವಿಸೊಮ್ಮನ್ನೂ
ವೂಲು ಪ್ರತಿಕಾರ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನಯ್ಯನವರ್ಗೆನದಲ್ಲಿ ಬರು
ವ ಸೊಮ್ಮನ್ನ ಳಳ್ಳು ಕೆಳಿಸಿದು ಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ನಿಷೇಧ ಪಾಂಡಿಯೆಕ್ಕೆ
ಆ ಕ್ಷೇಮದಾರನೆಂಬುವದು ಸ್ಥಿರಪಡ್ಸಿಯಿರುವೆವೆ

ದಾವಾದಲ್ಲಿ ನವಮತಂದುಮತೊರುವ ವಿಷಬಲನು

೧೦ ರೂ ಕೊಂಬು ಯಿಂವಿಂಕ್ಕೆ ವಾರೆ ಪ್ರತಿವಾದಿಗೆ ಕೊಂಡಿ
ದೆಂಬುವದು ಪಾಂಡಿಂಯುಕೊಂಡಾ ನಿವಶಕ್ಷನ ಪೇಳಿ ಸೋದ್ದಿ
6 ನೆ ನಕೊಟ್ಟಿಗಾಧ್ರುವುಲ್ಲ ವರುಷಕ್ಕೆ ಪ್ಲೀಡರ್ಗಳ್ಳು

ಮೇರಕ್ಕೆ.

ಶ

ಶ ಮಲ್ಲಿಕಾರ್ಜುನಯ್ಯ 6-12-0

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

0 ANNAS

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ಪಕ್ಷಗಳು ನಿನಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಮತ್ತು ಆಸ್ತಿಯನ್ನು ಅನುಭವಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅಡ್ಡಿ ಆತಂಕ ಮಾಡಿದವರಿಂದ ಬಿಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಮತ್ತು ಆಸ್ತಿಯ ಮೇಲೆ ಸಾಲ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಂತೆ ಈ ಕೆಳಗಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡುವುದಾಗಿ ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ರತಿಫಲವಾಗಿ ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವ ಹಣದಲ್ಲಿ ಶೇಕಡಾ 12½ ರೂಪಾಯಿಯಂತೆ ಕಮೀಷನ್ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಕೊಡಲು ಒಪ್ಪಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಕರಾರು ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ಬರೆದುಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುತ್ತೇವೆ.

ಮೊದಲನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರು ಎರಡನೆಯ ಪಕ್ಷದವರಿ

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by

ಎರಡು ಆಣೆ

MYSORE

S 1

ಈ ಪ್ರೊಸೀಡಿಂಗ್ಸ್ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ಮೇಲೆ ಬರೆಯಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದ್ದು ರೂ 6-0-0 ಮೌಲ್ಯದ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ರೂ 9-4-0 ಮೌಲ್ಯದ ನಕಲು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪ್ ಪೇಪರ್ ಗಳು ಅಂಟಿಸಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿವೆ.

ಪ್ರತಿಯಾಂದಕ್ಕೆ — — — — — — — — — — 3-8-0

ಅನಂತರ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಪು 2-0-0

ನಕಲ್ ಪ್ರತಿಗಳಿಗೆ — 1-8-0

ಇದು ನಿಮ್ಮ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಕೊಡಲ್ಪಟ್ಟಿದೆ.

ಈ ಕಛೇರಿಯು 31 ಮೇ 1866 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ — ಮೇಲ್ಕಂಡ ರೂಪಾಯಿ ಪಾವತಿಯಾಗಿ ಮುಕ್ತಾಯವಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಗಾಗಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಸೂಚಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ.

31 May 66.

True Copy

pKader Khan

Hd R. Keeper

District Court

Shimoga Division

Shimoga

Copy applied for on the	Applicant told to appear on the	Applicant appeared on the	Copying stopped for want of copying sheets on the	Additional copying sheets supplied on the
4/5/31	5/5/31			

Copy ready on the	Copy delivered on the	Copied by	Examined by
5/5/31	5/5/31	H Ramadikshit	A.R. Ajgaonkar

5-2

D.No. 116
29-7-31

Before the Govt. of H. H. the
Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz. Ap. 16 of 1930-31.

Applts		Respts
G. P. N. Mallappa & c.	vs.	Nadig Ramana & c.

Applts' memo.

Vakalat on behalf of applts. Nos. 1 and 10 as representing all the applts., is filed herewith. ET
The next date of hearing, when fixed, may be kindly intimated to me (and need not be intimated to previous advocate Mr C. Parthasarathi).

C Lakshmana Gowda
adv. for applts
28-7-31.

28.7.31

This case is placed in the Contested Rice
applns Perusal. No intimation
from Mr C. Parthasarathi Advocate
is received to the effect that he has
received his Commission in this
Appeal Case.

VS

Before the Govt. of H.H. the Maharaja of Mysore

~~IN THE COURT OF~~

Misc. Ap. 16 of 1930-31

Applt.

1. Y.P.N Mallappa,

10. B.M.C Aradhya

Respts.

vs. Nadig Ramanna k.

VAKALATNAMA

executed by the ~~applts. 1 and 10 above named~~ in favour of MR. C. LAKSHMANA GOUDA, B. A., B. L, Advocate, and ~~,, N. V. NARAYANA MURTHY, B. A., B. L.,~~ Advocate.

~~I~~/We hereby empower the said advocates, in person or by proxy, on ~~my~~/our behalf, to appear in, and conduct the above case, as well as any proceedings arising out of and connected with the same, to compromise the same, and to do all such acts as may be proper and necessary for the due conduct thereof including the signing, and presentation in Court, of the necessary petitions and papers.

And ~~I~~/we further authorize the said advocates to receive, and give receipts for, any money, document, or other moveable property, that is, or may become, payable or deliver able to ~~me~~/us in the course of the said case or proceedings.

[signature]

[signature]

27-7-1931.

I know the executants who ~~have~~ signed before me.

Accepted. C Lakshmana Gouda

28/7/31

From

Nadig Mylariah

Do. Yadgir

23/31

24/7/31.

To

The Secretary,

to

The Govt of His Highness the

Maharajah of Mysore,

Bangalore

Sir,

I beg permission to represent that I can not attend the Court on 29th on account of some domestic inconveniences & otherwise engagements elsewhere, to answer to the appeal No 16 of 10/7/31 against the order of the Mysore Commissioner before by P. V Mallappa & others in connection with the worship of the Moolasthana Mallikarjuna Swamy of Pura on the occasion of the car festival.

Hence pray humbly

your consent and that I may be

with all the necessa

evidence etc.

I beg to remain
Sir,
Your most obedient
Servant
[illegible]

The applicant is one of the respondents in the case.
As seen from the notice the postal, he was served
the receipt of notice on 16/7/31. After the lapse of 7 days
he has applied for an adjournment. Asked for orders

24/7

First Member) VS
24.7.31

Please put up when case called

Mrs
24.7
11/7

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

General and Revenue Secretariat

Dated, Bangalore, 18th March 32

No. 1298/Muz

From

Rajasevaparayana
B. SRINIVASA IYENGAR, Esq., B.A., B.L.,
Financial Secretary to the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

To

The Deputy Commissioner,

Kadur District, Chickmagalur.

Sir,

Subject:-Muzrai Appeal No.16 of 30-31 regarding the right of worship of Muladevaru in Sri Mallikarjunaswami Temple at Yagatipura on the annual Rathostava day.

Appellants :- Y.P.N. Mallappa, Pura Yagati Hobli.
Patel Puradappa.
N.M. Sivalingappiah & others.

Respondents:-
Nadigara Ramanna
" Mylariah & others.

S i r,

I am directed to enclose herewith for reference* papers relating to the service of Summons effected by the Kadur Taluk Amildar in connection with the above case that was posted for hearing on the 14th March 1932. The report from the Amildar is that the respondents have refused to accept service of notice. I am directed to observe that the Amildar should have made a full report as to why they have refused and if the refusal is a fact they should have been required to record the fact themselves. If they had refused to do so a mahazar should have been drawn up and got signed by respectable persons in the neighbourhood to the effect that the parties refused to accept service of notice.

* To be kindly returned.

I am to add that it is necessary to issue instructions to prevent such indifference to action which to be taken

taken in respect of service of notices.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

For Secretary to Government,
Financial Department.

K.M.R.2.
18-3.

Appendix F G—1]

JECT .....

.....

.....

Section Rev 3

File No.

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... No. 1298/Rev 3/32 dt 19-3-32

To

The D.C. Kadur at Chikmagalur.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 19-3-32

Signed by for R. Ivengar for Secretary to Govt.

Appellants:— Y. P. N. Mallappa Pma-Yagati Hobli - Patel Puttadappa - N m - Sivalingappa ~~Ele~~ Others

Respondents:— Nadiguna Ramanna & Mrs. Lariah ~~Others~~.

List of enclosures ....

To be duly returned

Copied by . .. .

Examined by ....

~~Sir~~ Rev 3 Appl No 16 of 30-31

re: the right of worship of Muladevaru in Sri Malleshwara Swami temple at Yagati Pma on the annual Rathotsava day

Sir,

I am directed to enclose papers relating to the hereinto for refee, service of Summons effected by the Kadur Tr Amildar in connection with the above Case there was posted hearing on the for 14th March 1932.

WD 71—GBPM—40,000—20-7-31

from the Amin bar is that the
respondents have refused to accept
Service of notice and I am direct
to ~~state~~ observe that the
Amin bar should have made
a full report as to why
they have refused and of
the refusal to attach
they should have been required
to record the fact themselves or a Mahazar signed
by respectable persons in the neighbourhood drawn up to
the effect that the
party refused to accept
Service of notice.

If they had refused to do so.
(Omit)
should himself

I am to add that it is necessary
to issue instructions to prevent
such inference to action
being taken in respect of
Service of notices.

I have &c

17/3/02

Mr Sec to Govt
Judl Dept

G S
17/3

BJECT .....

.....

.....

Section Mercy

File No. 206-30

Serial No. 6

Diary No. of letter replied to ....

No. 1373

To 1374

1 Mr C. Lakshmana Gowda B.A.B.L.
Advocate. Bangalore City.

2 Messrs C. Parthasarathy B.A.B.L. & C.S. Venkataraman Advocate Bangalore.

Subject: — Muz A.P.P. No. 16 of 30-31 in the matter of worship to Mulavane of Sri Mallikarjuna Swamis temple at Yagati Tq and Kadur Dt on the annual Rathotsava day.

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 23-3-33

Signed by M. R. Muddukrishna

Dear Sir,

When the above case was heard last on 25/4/32, the general lines of an amicable understanding to be observed between the two parties were suggested by you (1) ~~to~~ you stated ~~that~~ that Mr. Lakshmana Gowda should state that he

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by.....

(2) Mr. Lakshmana Gowda should state that he

would make a serious attempt
to ~~at inducing~~ prevail upon your clients
to agree to an arrangement
which might be considered
reasonable from the points
of ~~a~~ view of both the parties
~~To do this~~ (1) you ~~tracked~~ asked for time for about a month
~~for a month~~ (2) he for the purpose
of this was allowed. So far
no reply ~~is~~ has been received from
you - ~~In the circumstances~~
I now need to request you to
kindly say if any attempt
at settling this matter by
compromise was made & if so
with what result -

Yours faithfully -

E 21/3

~~For~~ H See

GS
21/3

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT,

Dated, Bangalore, 22nd March 1933.

D. O. No.

Subject.- Muzrai Appeal No. 16 of 1930-31 in the matter of worship to Mulavaru of Sri Mallikarjuna Swami temple at Yegatipura, Kadur Taluk, on the annual Rathotsava day.

Dear Sir,

When the above case was heard last on 25th April 1932, the general lines of an amicable understanding to be effected between the two parties were suggested:

(2) Mr. Lakshmana Gowda (1) you stated that he would make a serious attempt ~~to~~ at inducing your clients to agree to an arrangement which might be considered reasonable from the point of view of both the parties. (1) you (2) He asked for time for about a month for the purpose and this was allowed. So far no reply has been received from ~~you~~ him to

I am now to request you to kindly say if any attempt at settling this matter by compromise was made and if so with what result.

Yours faithfully,

For Financial Secretary to Government

1374 → To (1) Messrs C. Lakshmana Gowda

1373 → (2) C Parthasarathy & C S. Venkata Swami Advocates, Kunigal

23-3-33.

Mz 206-30



J/26/4/32

M. P.

27/Apr/32



From

Nadig Mylaraiah

Yagaly

(via) Hasan

22.4.32

To

The Financial Secretary

to His Highness the

Maharaja of Mysore,

Bangalore.

Most Honored Sir,

Pray humbly for permission to state the following to your kind notice & disposal in connection with muzarai appeal no 166/30-31 filed in your court by messrs Y. P. N. Mallappa, B. A. Sival in appeal & others:-

Summons in connection with the above appeal have been served on me to attend the Court on 2 But I am not in a position to a the Court owing to my illness for which a certificate from the local Native Doctor is obtained and herewith submitted. Secondly, Sri Kuoli-Sringari jagadguru is expected at Y on 25-4-32 & his presence

here is necessary Holiness' time
Programme no 249/31-32). Hence pray for
an adjournment-

64

That on behalf of the Brahmins of Agraharam I have to represent is that the said appellants had three Mahs preferred an appeal in Revenue Commission Court against the order of the Deputy Commissioner, Kadur District. That appeal was dismissed, (Vide appeal no 19 of 29-30) X on perusing the Statements of the Pujaris of the said temple and of the leading members of the Lingayat Community. Now also I have herewith submitted the copies of the same Statements for your kind consideration.

From time immemorial we had the right of worship of Mooladevaru and our claim was proved beyond doubt before some of the officers of the Kadur District against whose orders appeals now have been filed in your court.

Hence pray for going through the Records from the beginning & dispose the case in favour of justice. The Govt have decided in their Muzarai no 3184-558/18.4.1920 that all rights on Rathotsavadag (ರಥೋತ್ಸವದ) belongs to the Brahmins.

I beg to remain
Your most obedient Servant
ಹೆಚ್ ನಂಜುಂಡಯ್ಯ

V.R. (illegible)

No. 41.
20.4.32.

Yagati,
(Kadur Taluk)

ಕಾರ್ಡಿನ ಸಮ್ಮತಿಪತ್ರಕ್ಕೆ

ಕಡೂರು ತಾಲೂಕು ಯಗಟಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಗೆ ಪ್ಲೇಗ್‌ಅಂಧಮಾಸ್ಯಾ ಎಂಬುವರು ಸಂತೆಗಿಂದಲೂ ಪ್ಲೇಗ್ ಟಿಕಿತ್ಸೆಗಾಗಿ ಬಿಡಲ್ಪ ಅವಕಾಶಗಳಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಿವೇ. —

ನಿಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರಾರ್ಥಿಸಿಕೊಂಡ ಮೇರೆಗೆ ನಿಮಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಸಾಮಾನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಗಿಸಲು ಅನುಮತಿ ಪತ್ರವನ್ನು ನಂಬರ್ ಮೈಸೂರಾಗಿರುವುದು No. 1538 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಂದು 20.4.32 ನೇ ತಾರೀಖಿನಂದು ನಿಮಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ಹಿಂತಿರುಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ನಾನು ಸಾಂತ್ವನಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡಿರುವೆನು. ಇತಿ ನಿಮ್ಮ ವಿಶ್ವಾಸಿಗಳಾದ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದವರು. —

21/4/32.

ಎಂಬುದು.

M. Narayan Rao
21/4/32
Native Pandit
Yagati

Holy Week
of the Virgin Mary

ಅವುಲ್ಲರೂ ಜೀವಿಸಿ ನಾಲ್ಕನೆಯವರಾದ ಮೃದುಲಳನ್ನು
ನ. ದೇವಪ್ಪನವರಿಗೆ ಅಂದಂತಹವರೂ ತುಂಬಾ ಶ್ರೀ. ನಲ್ಲೂರು
ವೆಂಕಟಸುಬ್ಬಯ್ಯನವರಿಗೆ ಮೊದಲನೆಯವಳಾದ ಮೃದುಲಳನ್ನು
ಲಗ್ನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯವರೂ ತುಂಬಾ ಶ್ರೀ. ಈ ದಿನ ಮೃದುಲಳು ಶರೀರಸಂಬಂಧ
ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ದೇವರನ್ನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲವು ಜನರು
ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವರು. ಸಮಂಜಸವಲ್ಲ. ಕಾಲ್ಪನಿಕವಾದ ಮನಸ್ಸಿನಲ್ಲಿ
ಕ್ರಿಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಲಿಕೆಯಿಲ್ಲದವರು. ಇಂಥಲ್ಲಿ ಹೋಲಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ವಿವಾಹಸಂಬಂಧವಾದ ಸಮಯವನ್ನು ಅನುಸರಿಸಿ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ
ವರನನ್ನು ಅಪೇಕ್ಷಿಸುವಂಥವರು ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಿಂದ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು
ಅತ್ಯಂತ ವಿದ್ಯಾಭ್ಯಾಸ ಕಲಿತವರೆಗೂ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ ಅಜ್ಞಾನಿಗಳು
ಆಗಿದ್ದರು ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಞರಾಗಿ. ಮೂರುವರೆ ಲಿ. ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ನಡೆದ
ಅಂದರೆ ಅಸಂಬದ್ಧವಾಗಿ ಬಿಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದರು. ಮೂರುವರೆ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಿಂದ
ಮೂರುವರೆ ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ನಡೆದಿದ್ದರಿಂದ ಕಾಮ್ಯವಲ್ಲ.
ಲಗ್ನ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮೃದುಲಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವರು ಪ್ರಾಜ್ಞರು. ಇಷ್ಟೇ ನನ್ನ ಹೇಳಿಕೆಯು. ಇದಲಾಂಬುರು. ಇತಿ ಅಂಗೀಕಾರ
ಶ್ರೀ ಇಂದ ನನ್ನ ನಂಬು ೭೦. 21 ವಷ್ಟಿಗೆ ಬಿಂದವಾಗಿ...

Sd/- ನಾನಲ್ಲಿ ಪತ್ರಿಕೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಂದಿರುವ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ದಾಖಲೆ

(Sd/) In English
27/1/1919

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Section Mus

File No. 206 - 30

Serial No.

Diary No. of letter replied to ..... 1266 .....

No. 203.

To 204.

(1) Mrs C. Lakshmanaswami
BA BL
Advocate Bangalore City

(2) Messrs C. Parthasarathy Iyengar & Srinivasa
Venkatachari. Advocates
Bangalore City

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

the *193* .

Date of issue 14/8/33

Signed by W. B. Muddukrishna

Subject:- Mus appl no 16 of 30-31 re: Worship to the devaru of Sri Malleshwaraswami temple at Yagatipura - Kadur Tk on the annual Rate of rent fixed

Sirs, I am directed to invite your kind attention to this office letter no 1374 dt 23.8.33 and to 1373 dt same date regarding the above mentioned matter.

List of enclosures.....

Copied by.....

Examined by .....

WD 0253—GPB—15,000—26-8-32

BEFORE THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE

MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

Muz. Appeal No. 16 of 1930-31.

75

Appellants.	Vs.	Respondents.
(1) Y.P.N.Malleppa son of Patel Nanjegowda, Pura, Yagati Hobli, Kadur Taluk.		Nadigara Ramanna, Nadigara Kylariah and others.
(2) M.M.Sivalingappiah and 24 others.		

Subject.

Right of worship to Sri Mallikarjuna Swami at Yagati Pura, Kadur Taluk, on the annual Rathotsava day.

The case was called on 9th April 1934. Mr.C.Lakshmana Gowda, Advocate for the appellants was present and was heard; the respondents though served with notices were not present.

O R D E R.

The appeal is from the Order of the Muzrai Commissioner rejecting the appeal from the order of the Deputy Commissioner. After the appeal was filed, efforts were made by the parties to arrive at a reasonable compromise in the matter. For that purpose, a number of adjournments were granted from time to time. The records show that after hearing the appellant's counsel on the 25th April 1933, it was stated that an amicable understanding on certain lines was suggested to the parties. The counsel of the appellants seems to have stated that they were making serious attempts to induce the parties to come to a reasonable arrangement, and that if more time was given, there was every chance of the parties coming to an agreement.

7b

Further time was accordingly given. But when the hearing was again taken up on the 9th of April 1934, the Advocate stated that all attempts at compromise had been fruitless and that the case might be disposed of on its merits.

The Muzrai Commissioner agreeing with the Deputy Commissioner, found that the mamool was in favour of the respondents. No convincing arguments were advanced before Government to controvert this view. After a careful examination of the records, Government agree with the order passed by the then Muzrai Commissioner, Mr. P. G. D'Souza, and dismiss the petition.

No 8496/Mus 206-30 MRAR-9 dt 19-12-35

Copy to Mr.C.Lakshmana Gowda, Advocate for the appellants.

By order,

for General Secretary to Government.

No 847 dt 19.12.35 to the Religious Endowments Dept for information.

No 848 dt 19.12.35 to the Deputy Commissioner, Kanara, returning the records received from him.

Muz. 21]

6 cases

Before the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

Muz Appeal No. 16 of 1930-31

Appellants Sangappa Patel Nanjegowda Vs. Respondents

(1) Y. P. N. Mallappa — Puja Nabigana Ramanna
Yagati Hobli - Kadur Tq Mylaiah & others
(2) V. M. Sivalingappiah ~~and Etc~~
~~Etc~~ & 24 others.
~~(Same Point)~~

Subject.

Right of worship to Sri Mallikarjuna swamy at Yagati Puja — Kadur Tq, on the annual Rathotsava day.

The case was called on 9th April 1934 — Mr. C. Lakshmana Gowda BA BL Advocate for the appellants was present & was heard; The respondents though served with notices were not present —

order

(Here enter paras 6 × and 66 of the rules)

(Page 13 of the rules)

No 46/Misc 206-30-9
Copy to Mr. C. Lakshmana Gowda BA BL Advocate for appellants —

Order 19-12-35
B. O
17/12

WD 0550—GPB—200—10-5-22

R. S. App. F. G. 3.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Continuation sheet draft form.)

No 847/Secy dy 19-12-31
Copy to Nadigama Ramakuna, Nadigama
Mylanial & others for information.
B. O
19/12
for Secy
Memo No Rest/Secy dy 19-12-3
Copy to the End Receipt No. for reference
records received with his
letter No NS-O/30-3 dy 14-3-3
B. O
19/12
for Secy.
GS
16/1/32